

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
February 1, 2007**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dennis Cope, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols, Mery Velastegui

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gary Lee, Senior Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:08 PM. Design Review Board members Robert Hall, Lee Madrid, and David Wobker were excused.

**APPROVAL**

**L040169, Redmond Court – Change in Approved Materials**

**Description:** Construction of 20 townhomes with ground floor work spaces and approximately 2,300 square feet retail space

**Location:** Southeast corner of 160<sup>th</sup> Ave NE and NE 63<sup>rd</sup> Street

**Applicant Request:** Approval of change in exterior materials

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval of change in brick color, denial of change in roof material

**Applicant:** Mark Gibbs with Kauri LLC

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report on this proposal to change building materials. The applicant was requesting a different and lighter color for the accent brick along the window and door headers and to change the roof material from a standing seam metal material to an asphalt shingle. The staff recommendation was to approve the change in the brick material but not the roofing material.

Joshua Loman, representing the applicant, explained that the buying public is expressing concern over the noise that results from metal roofs so they want to address that. They looked around the neighborhood and saw that overall there is a composite material on roofs along the streetscape. He brought some photos to demonstrate that the general streetscape would not really be affected. He explained that they want to keep this building consistent with what is already established out there. In exchange for that, they wanted to warm up the streetscape by taking an accent brick for headers above the doors along 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 83<sup>rd</sup> Street. The eyes would be drawn to the accent areas and not to the roof areas.

**COMMENTS BY THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Ms. Velastegui:**

- Commented that she had heard no complaints about noise from metal roofs.
- Said that the applicant would have to add sound insulation under the metal roof.
- Commented that the building fascia had better quality and a better looking view from the building across from it.
- Said that the roof would add higher quality to the building and would be a precedent for the neighborhood.
- Had no problems with changing the brick.
- Was not convinced about changing the roof material.

**Mr. Cope:**

- Thought the additional detailing with brick was fine, but did not think it would cost more so would not be a trade for a composite roof.



- Could not support a change in the roof. That is what they approved. The roof could be seen by the courtyard and the people one floor up.

Mr. Meade:

- Determined that the roof had a slope way under 3:12 so the applicant would have to ice and water shield the whole roof.
- Figured that the slope was 2:12 and advised that the applicant would probably have to do a redesign to get the roof to function.
- Confirmed with the applicant that the price point would be \$400,000 for the units of 1,000 square feet.
- Thought the brick detail would look great—a classic choice.
- Could see what the Design Review Board considered regarding the metal roof originally. This would not look more or less residential by the roof material. Said there were ways to mitigate the sound concerns—sound insulation or a different metal roof. Deferred to everyone else's choice.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Appreciated the position the applicant was in with the buying public.
- Noted that there is a lot of roof on the project, but that was one of the things the DRB members really liked about this project. Her inclination was to stay with the metal roof with the caveat that if the applicant found something else they liked better they could return again for a review. Going from a standing seam metal roof to composite would be a big leap.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO APPROVE L040169, REDMOND COURT, BY ACCEPTING THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE THE BRICK DETAILING AND TO DENY THE CHANGE IN THE ROOF MATERIAL. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 7:25 P.M. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**PRE060042, Redmond TOD**

**Description:** Six-story mixed use building to include approximately 300,000 square feet, occupancy 324 units with 15,000 square feet of retail space and 150,000 square feet of parking structure

**Location:** 161<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE and NE 83<sup>rd</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Tom Eanes with Hewitt Architects

**Prior Review Date:** 9/21/06 and 11/2/06

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report for this third pre-application review of the Redmond Transportation Oriented Development. One issue was the courtyard width which staff believed could be worked with to address concerns about being too narrow by using more open landscaping that is not too confining.

David Hewitt, Hewitt Architects, 119 Pine Street #400, Seattle, WA 98101, showed the progress they had made on the exterior elevations and what they had been doing to respond to the concerns about the silhouette of the building, the building modulation, and the various ways of handling the materials. They had changed some of the proportions. He noted the brick base on the building, the dark aluminum windows on the front, and the canopies that surrounded the building, creating an undulation of the façade. He suggested that the bricks be brought up to the level of the elements. The sunscreen gave some variety to the horizontality of the canopies. For the indentation of the stair, the masonry was brought up to the second story. There was some discussion about the tops of the buildings needing a bit more refinement so they were suggesting projecting the roofs and the beams to create an overhang. To the elevation on 161<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE, they had added quite a bit of articulation to the silhouette of the building. They proposed using rigid bents to support the canopies. The metal siding they are proposing to use is a finer grain material that can be detailed in a sophisticated way, and not a cheap corrugated metal. The roof edges had a treatment of the lintel. They pulled the entrance to the garage with a drop down off the street to the side of the building. There was pedestrian access and a green area. They would be using



green screens to foliate the base of the building. The parking garage is at the beginning of the 30-foot mid-block connector. He showed the elevations and their articulations. They added a saddle tan color as an accent color for the rose and sand colors. He said that the colors are much richer in the daylight. He showed the brick color proposed for the base. He showed the Hardiplank they were proposing to use, which was smooth and without veins in it.

Kristen Lundquist, 600 N 85<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 102, Seattle, WA 98103, spoke about the landscape plan for the courtyards. They had met with staff several times to discuss the courtyards to make them more inviting. The main courtyard was widened, and the planters pulled back. They plan to use plant material that is unique to the rest of the courtyards. They proposed using black bamboo to sustain the tower corners and to set the center courtyard apart from the rest of the courtyards. In addition to plant material and open space, they have looked at different paving patterns and have come to a random pattern suggesting architectural slab pavers, then weaving in a couple of accent colors. The courtyard to the north had undergone some significant changes in space used for circulation. That space is used mostly by residents and provides an opportunity for gathering space. They have provided a radius pathway and have allowed circulation for people to get from the courtyard to their private units and yet have privacy. They have increased the size of the planters there and plan to use a tapestry of plants. They would use berming in these spaces to provide soil depth for some evergreen trees and also use some ornamental grasses. For the mid-block connector, they proposed to use berming and meanders. For the garage walls, they proposed to use green screen with Boston ivy. They also proposed a tree canopy with columnar quaking aspen. She showed a sampler with the plants they are proposing. In the south zone, they would try to maintain as many of the existing trees as possible. The area creates kind of a pocket park feel. There is not room for play equipment, so they proposed to have a passive use of the space and to include boulders for children to climb.

Bill Rutledge, 19336 47<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98155, gave details on the 229 decks proposed for the project.

#### **COMMENTS BY THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:**

##### Mr. Cope:

- Appreciated the presentation and receptiveness of the applicant to the Board's previous comments.
- Liked this project from the first and thought it was getting better.
- Appreciated the documentation.
- Liked the two-story brick on the elevations.
- Liked the cap; thought the cap just the right size and detail.
- Liked the transit stop elevation—such a nice scale because of the way the buildings move back from the street and because of being fairly narrow and having nice scale.
- Liked the mid-block connector.
- Supported the project.
- Wished that over time they could see the south and west elevations make a better gesture to the sun shading.
- Thought this an excellent project.
- Liked its density.
- Thought it would be a fun place to live.

##### Mr. Meade:

- Asked for a description of how the roof worked. (The applicant explained that they extended the parapet higher to support the cap—somewhere between an applicant decoration and a structural idea.)
- Commented that the edges could be quite thin because it is not insulated and is a sloped roof.
- Thought the north courtyard needed something more to create a terminus of the pathway. (The applicant said they decided to allow access at that edge. They do not know the placement of the door at that spot yet.)
- Appreciated the project, especially the north elevation.
- Liked the end pieces.



Ms. Velastegui:

- Was impressed with the east elevation because it was the hardest elevation.
- Liked the changing of the color and the rhythm of the building.
- Suggested making some meandering of the landscape instead of making it straight like the wall one story up.
- Suggested adding some undulation of that wall from the south and north. (Could do something with the landscape screens to mitigate that wall.)
- Appreciated the dark band created on the three floors between the vertical elements and the base.
- Wanted to know where the Hardiplank was. (Mr. Hewitt showed the areas where the Hardiplank was located, which was close to 50% of the facades. He said he thought it made a nice, smooth texture for a residential building. He noted some metal in the burgundy recesses and some dark green projections.)

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Liked all the improvements.
- Commented that on the paving of the courtyards, which she liked, the applicant might want to take a look at going darker or lighter to distinguish somehow the private spaces. (The applicant already planned to do that, possibly by using a wood element close to the units.)

Mr. Lee added that staff had talked with King County about the transit center corner. King County is fine with what the applicant proposed. Two trees would be lost to make that work.

The Design Review Board members agreed that corner was fine. Staff would handle this administratively.

Mr. Lee explained that Public Works had looked at making the east-west alley connection. The plan might not reflect the end result of the Public Works review. The applicant would have to make that corner compatible with the future connection that would be made there.

There was agreement that the project was ready for application.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:20 PM. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**